DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 647 88 EA 003 967

AUTHOR	Denham, Carolyn H.
TITLE	Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title III in Massachusetts/ an Evaluation. A Study of Variables Related to Success, Continuation, and Dissemination of Title III Projects.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Boston.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	21p.
AVAILABLE FROM	New York State ERIC Service, Room 468 EBA, State Education Department, Albany, New York 12224. (Microfiche copies available free to educators)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Adoption (Ideas); Educational Change; Educational Problems; Educational Programs; *Educational Research; *Federal Aid; *Information Dissemination; Problem Solving; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; Questionnaires; *State Departments of Education; State Programs; Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III; Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

This publication represents a major attempt by the Massachusetts Department of Education to involve itself in what educators call the "change process" -- using research to help develop solutions to educational problems, and disseminating results to facilitate adoption of those solutions by many schools. Title III provides federal funds in periodic grants to local schools to stimulate the development of creative solutions to educational problems. Each Title III project in Massachusetts is responsible for evaluating the success of its stated objectives and for disseminating that information. This study was undertaken to provide an overview of the change process and account for its successes and failures. It affords administrators a statewide perspective on their own rate of change, and suggests new priorities for the Department's staff as well. (Author)

Massachusetts Board of Education	Mrs. Rae Cecilia Kipp, Chairman John S. Sullivan, Vice-Chairman Richard L. Banks Walter N. Borg Mrs. Ramona L. Corriveau William P. Densmore J. Richard Early Allan R. Finlay William H. Gassett Joseph Salerno Joseph G. Weisberg
Commissioner of Education	Neil V. Sullivan
Deputy Commissioner of Education	Thomas J. Curtin
Associate Commissioner of Education	Max Bogart
Director, Bureau of Curriculum Services	Robert A. Watson
ESEA Title III Coordinator	Donald J. Torres
ESEA Title III Staff	Judith Dortz Roselyn Frankenstein David Jackman Barb Kaufman Martin Martinian Jeanne Maguire Scott Waddleton

ED 058647

Publication of this document approved by Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent.
10M-10-71-050514
Estimated cost per copy $ .23

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Title III in Massachusetts/ an Evaluation

A Study of Variables Related to Success, Continuation, and Dissemination of Title III Projects

by Carolyn H. Denham

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1971

EA 003 967

NOTE

"Supposing is good, but finding out is better."

Mark Twain

This publication represents a major attempt by the Massachusetts Department of Education to involve itself in what educators call the "change process" - using research to help develop solutions to educational problems, and disseminating results to facilitate adoption of those solutions by many schools.

As part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (amended 1967), Title III provides federal funds in periodic grants to local schools to stimulate the development of creative solutions to educational problems. Federal guidelines spell out the objective: "To translate the latest educational knowledge about teaching and learning into widespread educational programs and to create an awareness of new programs and services of high quality that can be incorporated in school programs."

Each Title III project in Massachusetts is responsible for evaluating the success of its stated objectives, and disseminating that information. This is a necessary step in gaining enough local support to continue operation at the end of the federal funding period (usually three years); it is also essential for incorporating these newly developed programs and services into other schools in the Commonwealth.

Through its Title III staff, the state should provide an overview of this change process, and account for its successes and failures. The following study was undertaken for just this purpose. It affords administrators a statewide perspective on their own rate of change, and suggests new priorities for the Department's staff as well.

Donald Torres, Coordinator,
E.S.E.A. Title III

This research was sponsored by the Bureau of Curriculum Innovation. Dr. Carolyn H. Denham, an Assistant Professor of Education at California State College, Long Beach, constructed and conducted the study. She was formerly a supervisor of evaluation of E.S.E.A. Title III projects in the Bureau of Curriculum Innovation, Massachusetts Department of Education.

Limited copies of this free publication are available from:

ESEA Title III, Bureau of Curriculum Services, Massachusetts Department of Education, 182 Tremont Street, Boston, MA 02111

Table of Contents

I Introduction 1

II Hypothesis 2

III Data Collection 3

IV Summary of Findings 3

V Conclusions and Recommendations 7

APPENDIX

A Data Analysis 11

B Questionnaire for Superintendents who have never received Title III funds 13

C Questionnaire for Superintendents who have received Title III funds 14

I. Introduction

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 included a $100 million authorization for supplementary services and centers under Title III. An examination of the Act itself and subsequent interpretations by the U.S. Office of Education show how the Title became associated with demonstration centers for educational innovation, seed money for diffusion of innovations, and risk money for experimentation in school reforms.[1] The present study is an attempt to assess how well the Title III program in Massachusetts has conformed to the idea of Title III as a force for educational innovation: the extent to which projects have met the expectations of superintendents, the extent to which they have been continued in the school district beyond the termination of federal funding, and the extent to which the educational practices they demonstrate have been adopted by other school districts.

A survey of all superintendents of schools in Massachusetts was conducted to determine the extent to which Title III innovations have spread outside the school districts receiving the grants, the attitudes of superintendents toward the spread of innovations, and the superintendents' sources of information about innovations. Additional questions were asked of the superintendents of districts participating in Title III grants to determine the extent of dissemination, continuation, and success of the projects. Recommendations are made concerning funding, evaluation of project proposals, and dissemination.

A similar study was conducted by Hearn,[2] who surveyed superintendents throughout the United States. However, the

---

[1]Hearn, Norman E. Innovative Educational Programs: A Study of the Influence of Selected Variables Upon Their Continuation Following the Termination of Three-Year ESEA Title III Grants. Sponsored by the Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association. Washington, D. C.: September 30, 1969, pp. 1-6.

[2]Op. cit.

present study provides information not found in the former study. Whereas the present study surveyed all superintendents in Massachusetts, the Hearn Study omitted those in districts not receiving Title III funds and those in districts participating in a regional project but not serving as the administrator of the grant funds for the regional group. The present study affords the opportunity for a close look at the workings of Title III within a single state, gives more recent statistics than does the Hearn study, and provides information on how well the projects met superintendents' expectations.

II. Hypothesis

1. Districts receiving Title III grants or participating in a Title III regional project are more likely to adopt Title III innovations from outside their district than are non-Title III districts.

2. Regional and single district projects differ in how well they meet the expectations of superintendents.

3. Single district projects are more often continued after the termination of federal funds than are regional projects.

4. The local educational agency or LEA, the school district entrusted with the grant money for districts in a regional project, differs from the other districts participating in the project in the extent to which the project meets the superintendents' expectations.

5. The LEA differs from the other districts participating in the project in the frequency of continuation after termination of federal funds.

6. For single district projects the extent to which superintendents' expectations are met is related to the size of the grant.

7. For regional projects the extent to which superintendents' expectations are met is related to the size of the grant.

8. For single district projects the frequency of continuation after termination of federal funds is related to the size of the grant.

9. For regional projects the frequency of continuation after termination of federal funds is related to the size of the grant.

III. Data Collection

A one-page questionnaire was mailed to all 270 superintendents in Massachusetts on April 30, 1971. An additional two pages of questions was sent to those 143 superintendents whose districts had received or were receiving Title III funds. By May 28, 52% of the superintendents had responded. A second mailing on May 28 elicited enough responses to bring the response rate up to 222 or 83% (113 or 86% for superintendents with Title III projects, and 109 or 79% for all other superintendents). Tabulations of the responses are given in the Appendix. The questionnaire was designed to obtain information on the status of Title III projects, such as the percent of projects being continued, as well as data for testing the hypotheses.

IV. Summary of Findings

The results of the statistical tests of the hypotheses are as follows:

1. Title III districts were significantly more likely to pick up Title III innovations outside their district than were non-Title III districts.

2. No significant difference was found between regional and single district projects in how well they met expectations of superintendents.

3. Single district projects were significantly more likely to be continued than were regional projects.

4, 5. No significant difference was found between the LEA for a regional project and the other districts participating in the regional in extent to which expectations were met or the likelihood of continuation.

6, 7. No significant difference was found, for either single district projects or regionals, between the mean size of the grant for those projects meeting objectives and the mean grant size for those not meeting objectives.

8, 9. No significant difference was found, for either single district projects or regionals, between the mean size of the grant for those projects which were continued and the mean grant size for those which were not continued.

The results of the tabulations of responses are as follows:

1. Almost all of the superintendents (96%) had heard of one or more ESEA Title III projects outside his district and almost all of these (90%) were familiar with one or more project.

2. Among Title III superintendents, those superintendents whose districts had received a Title III grant or participated in a Title III regional project, 53% indicated that their school district or an educator in their district had changed or modified some educational procedure in response to ideas or information gained from an ESEA Title III project outside the district. Among other superintendents, 28% indicated such changes.

3. The project most often mentioned as influencing other school districts was Project SPOKE; it was mentioned by 20 other districts. The Amherst Model Kindergarten project was mentioned 6 times; Project COD was mentioned 4 times. Twenty-six other projects were mentioned one or two times each. Project SPOKE, located in Norton, is a regional resource center for teachers providing in-service programs, instructional materials and facilities for teachers to produce their own instructional materials. The Amherst Model Kindergarten is an experimental "child-centered" kindergarten. Project COD, located in New Bedford, is a regional service center for curriculum development with emphasis on training teachers and administrators for leadership roles in curriculum improvement.

4. Superintendents whose districts had adopted parts of other Title III projects were asked to state how they found out about the projects. Superintendents whose districts had their own Title III's most often found out from their own Title III people. Next in importance, in descending order were (a) staff members of Title III projects outside their district, (b) Title III meetings, workshops, and fairs, (c) "Kaleidoscope," and (d) professional conferences. Other superintendents mentioned a variety of sources, with "Kaleidoscope" being the only source mentioned more than once. (It was mentioned twice.) "Kaleidoscope" is a serialized booklet describing educational innovations in Massachusetts published by the Bureau of Curriculum Innovation of the Massachusetts Department of Education.

5. When asked which sources they found most helpful in gaining information on educational innovations, Title III superintendents listed, in descending order of importance:

(a) Publications from the Bureau of Curriculum Innovation, the bureau in the Massachusetts Department of Education responsible for administering Title III funds.

(b) Professional conventions.

(c) Visits to innovative projects.

(d) Other school administrators.

(e) Mailings of pamphlets, newsletters, etc.

(f) Professional journals

Other superintendents listed the following sources:

(a) Other school administrators

tied (b) Publications from the Bureau of Curriculum Innovations

tied (c) Professional conventions

(d) Mailings of pamphlets, newsletters, etc.

(e) Professional journals

(f) Visits to innovative projects

6. The journals mentioned as most helpful in gaining information on educational innovations were, in descending order:

(a) Phi Delta Kappan

(b) Educational Leadership

(c) Nation's Schools

(d) School Management

In all, 29 journals were mentioned.

7. Superintendents were asked their opinions on three statements about educational innovations:

(a) Sixty-four percent disagreed or disagreed strongly to the following statement: "In Massachusetts we are proceeding too rapidly in introducing into the schools innovations which have not been thoroughly tested." Title III superintendents were slightly more inclined to disagree than were other superintendents.

(b) Seventy-two percent agreed or agreed strongly to the following statement: "It

is difficult to obtain reliable information for assessing the merits of popular educational innovations." Non-Title III superintendents were slightly more inclined to agree.

(c) Eighty-five percent agreed or agreed strongly to the following statement: "My school district is usually supportive of attempts to introduce innovation." Title III superintendents were slightly more inclined to agree.

8. Seventy-one percent of the Title III superintendents reported that their project had met or exceeded expectations. Twenty-eight percent of the projects exceeded expectations; forty-three percent met expectations. In tabulations of responses of Title III superintendents, those superintendents of districts with more than one Title III project are counted more than once.

9. Forty-eight percent of the Title III superintendents reported that the evaluation data were useful in making decisions about the project. Twenty-one percent were uncertain; for eighteen percent, the evaluation data were not yet available. Twelve percent did not think that the evaluation data had been useful.

10. Fifty-four percent of the Title III superintendents said that Title III had definitely made their community more open to innovation. Thirty percent said that Title III made their community only somewhat more open to innovation.

11. Only nine Title III superintendents knew of other school districts which had adopted all or part of their ESEA Title III project. One superintendent stated that 30 districts had adopted the Title III innovation of his district; the others knew of one to 12 districts each. The means of dissemination listed by these districts were visits by teachers, newsletters, conferences sponsored by the project, and "direct communication."

12. Sixty-nine percent of the Title III superintendents reported that the projects were being continued or were likely to be continued after the termination of federal funding (38% on a smaller scale, 24% on the same scale, and 8% on a larger scale). Twenty-three percent were reported not to be continuing, but if this figure is adjusted for those for which there was "[no] necessity to continue" and those being continued by other than local funds, only twelve percent are not being continued. Eight

percent of the superintendents were uncertain about the continuation of the projects. These are not unlike the figures reported by Hearn, who found that 80% of Massachusetts projects would be continued and 20% would not be continued; since the data in the present study includes all districts involved in a regional project, the percentage of continuation figure is weighted more heavily by regional projects in the present study than in the Hearn study.

13. The most frequently cited reasons for not continuing are listed in descending order of frequency:

(a) Project too expensive for the district to continue

(b) District never really committed to the project from the beginning

(c) Project not successful in meeting its objectives

(d) Uncertainty of federal funds

(e) Inadequacy of public relations within the community

tied (f) Personnel problems

tied (g) Not enough time to demonstrate the value of the project

tied (h) Failure of the project staff to work closely with the school administrators

V. Conclusion and Recommendations

1. Some information about Title III projects seems to be circulating fairly well; almost all superintendents are familiar with at least one Title III project outside their district. But the rate of adoption of innovations, as would be expected, is quite a bit lower. In his study, Hearn found that 47% of superintendents of LEAs were aware of similar programs started elsewhere as a result of visits to their project; on the average, they knew of 20.4 new programs each. In the present study only 8% of the superintendents reported knowledge of adoption in other districts; the mean number of districts was 7. This leads us to suspect that the rate of adoption of Title III innovations has been slower in Massachusetts than for the U.S. as a whole.

2. Since so few superintendents knew of other dis-

tricts that had adopted the innovations, perhaps a better feedback system for dissemination should be required. A project could be required to find out which of its dissemination methods were leading to adoption of the innovation by other districts.

3. A project may need more than three years for dissemination. This might be accomplished by giving districts continuing projects extra money for dissemination, or it might be accomplished by convincing districts continuing projects to keep up the dissemination activities themselves.

4. The rate of adoption of Title III innovations from outside the district was significantly lower for non-Title III superintendents. This may reflect in part the type of districts to which Title III monies have gone, but it also may be a result of the forming of a community of Title III recipients who share ideas. Evidence for the existence of this community is the sources of information on innovation mentioned by Title III superintendents. Title III staffs and Title III meetings were major sources of information. The existence of such a community is an additional benefit for districts with Title III funds. However, it may be perpetuating the problem of certain districts being more sophisticated in their ability to think of projects that have a good chance of being funded, to write proposals, and to carry out grants, whereas the Title III office has a responsibility not to favor the existing "Title III Community" in awarding grants.

The "community" can be a valuable aid in dissemination, however, particularly if it makes an effort to reach non-Title III districts. Since non-Title III administrators rely heavily on other school administrators for ideas on innovation, Title III staffs should keep school administrators in their own districts informed so that they can disseminate information to other administrators. Perhaps the administrators and their Title III staffs could also make presentations at professional conventions and contribute to professional journals, particularly those journals mentioned by respondents. Visits to innovative projects have been less important as a source of information for non-Title III superintendents than for Title III superintendents; perhaps non-Title III superintendents are not being invited to visit projects often enough.

5. In dissemination, care should be taken to give complete and reliable information. Superintendents, particularly non-Title III superintendents, complain about the difficulty of obtaining reliable information,

and quite a few are concerned about the rate of adoption of innovations which have not been thoroughly tested. Informal explanations, as well as formal presentations and articles, would be more effective if they included a frank discussion of pros and cons and did not try to impress with modish terminology. Both Massachusetts Department of Education personnel and project personnel should be willing and able to answer questions on the effectiveness of the project and to discuss whether or not they would recommend the program for another district. This would require that they be familiar with evaluation results and that evaluators present readable reports that can be used in explaining the pros and cons of the project to outsiders. Evaluation services can be subcontracted by both the LEA and the SEA (State Educational Agency), but the permanent staffs of these agencies should understand and be familiar with the results of these evaluations.

6. The Bureau of Curriculum Innovation can be pleased with the readership of its publications. Bureau publications are listed as the most important source of information on innovations for Title III superintendents and are listed second for other superintendents. "Kaleidoscope" was an important source of information on Title III projects for both groups of administrators. However, dissemination should include personal contacts as well as the printed word; this is emphasized by the lists of sources of information considered most useful by superintendents. Perhaps the Bureau of Curriculum Innovation should choose a few of the most successful projects and begin to disseminate them by visits to individual school districts or groups of educators. The Bureau of Curriculum Innovation could also disseminate information in a useful form to other members of the Massachusetts Department of Education so that they in turn could talk to educators in the state.

7. The success of project SPOKE in dissemination should be examined. Perhaps its methods of dissemination were particularly effective; perhaps its product was particularly easy for educators in other districts to adopt. When choosing projects for funding, it might be wise to consider which projects would be the easiest to disseminate and would have the greatest impact across the state.

8. Not only are non-Title III districts sometimes left out of the dissemination process, but a project's own LEA may be neglected. Reasons for projects not continuing include "inadequacy of public relations within the community" and "failure of the project staff to work closely with school administrators." Plans for community and administration involvement should be included in the proposal.

9. In general, most of the Title III projects met or exceeded the expectations of the superintendents, made the participating communities more open to innovation, and are being or will be continued. This is very encouraging information.

10. The fact that almost half of the projects found evaluation data valuable is encouraging, but there is room for improvement. Projects should be helped to gather more useful evaluation data.

11. Reasons cited for projects not being continued should be reviewed. The most frequent complaint was that the project was too expensive for the district to continue, but Hearn found that the mean size of budgets of continued projects was twice the size of that for discontinued projects. These seemingly conflicting statements plus the fact that no significant differences were found in the present study between the mean size of the budget of continued and discontinued projects suggest a complex relationship between budget size and continuation. The number of pupils served by the grant, the type of project, and the wealth of the community are probably all related to the problem. Proposed budgets should be examined closely for all of these factors.

12. The present study found that regional projects were less likely to be continued than were single district projects. (Hearn, however, found no significant difference.) The finding of the present study suggests that, at least in Massachusetts, many of the school districts need some supportive structure or incentives other than three years of Title III money if they are to work cooperatively for more than three years. Until such incentives are found, granting money to regional projects will be more risky than granting money to single districts.

13. An encouraging fact about regional projects, however, is that money granted to regional projects probably does benefit more districts than just the LEA. No significant differences were found in the extent to which LEA's and other participating districts met expectations and continued the project. Also, there was no significant difference between regionals and single district projects in their effectiveness in meeting expectations.

14. In summary, Title III projects in Massachusetts did well in meeting the expectations of superintendents and improving openness to innovation within the LEA or participating district. The single district projects did particularly well in continuing the programs after termination of federal funds. Title III projects did less well in spreading innovations throughout the state. Suggested

priorities for improvement are the rate of adoption of innovations by non-Title III districts and the rate of continuation of regional Title III projects.

APPENDIX

A Data Analysis

One test of statistical significance was performed for each of the hypotheses:

1. The first test was a comparison of responses by Title III superintendents and non-Title III superintendents to the following question: "Has your school district (or any educator in your district) changed or modified any educational procedures in response to ideas or information gained from ESEA Title III projects outside your district?" A chi-square of 20.19 with 2 degrees of freedom was significant beyond the .01 level. Tnus there was a significant difference in the responses of the two groups, with more Title III superintendents replying "yes" and more non-Title III superintendents replying "no."

2. The second test was a chi-square comparing Title III superintendents with regional projects to those with single district projects in their responses to the following question: "How well has the project come up to your expectations?" Those answering "exceeded expectations" or "met expectations" were grouped together; those answering "fell somewhat short of expectations" or "fell far short of expectations" were grouped together. The chi-square was not significant ($\chi^2 = 1.44$, df = 1).

3. The third test was a chi-square comparing regional and single district projects on the following questions: "Is the project being continued (or likely to be continued) after the termination of federal funding?" Responses were grouped into two categories: (1) "no" and (2) "yes, on a smaller scale or with only some of the components," and "yes, on the same scale," and "yes, on a larger scale." "Uncertain" responses were omitted. Also omitted were superintendents answering "no" but who indicated that the

project was being continued by other than local funds or that there was no necessity to continue since the objectives were completed within the time span provided by federal funds. The chi-square was singificant beyond the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 5.32$, df = 1) with single districts being more likely to continue projects. In fact, all of the 22 single district projects were being continued, whereas 37 of the 50 regional projects (74%) were being continued.

4, 5. The fourth and fifth tests were comparisons of responses of superintendents whose districts were LEAs for regional projects and those whose districts were participants in regional projects. Chi-square tests uncovered no significant differences between LEA districts and participant districts on the following two questions: "How well has the project come up to your expectations?" and "Is the project being continued (or likely to be continued) after the termination of federal funding?"

6, 7. The sixth and seventh significance tests were comparisons of the size of grants for projects which met expectations to the size of grants for those which did not meet expectations. The average size of the grant over the operational years of a project was used to represent the size of the grant. The sixth test was a t test comparing mean grant sizes for single district projects. The mean for projects which met expectations was $76,720; the mean for those that did not meet expectations was $85,330. However, the value of t was not significant.

The seventh test was an analysis of variance among the means for regional projects. Superintendents within the same regional project were grouped together for the analysis; they could not be considered separate cases since their budgets were, of course, identical. A regional project was classified as meeting expectations if 65% or over of the superintendents responding indicated that the project met expectations; if 65% or over of the superintendents indicated that the project did not meet expectations, it was put into a second group; otherwise, it was placed into a third group. Regional projects represented by only one responding district were not classified. The analysis of variance did not uncover significant differences between mean grant sizes for regional projects with varying degrees of success.

8, 9. The mean grant size for projects which were continued was compared to the mean grant size of projects which were not continued. No significance test was necessary to determine that there was no significant relationship between grant size for single district

projects and continuation of the projects: all single district projects were continued (except those omitted from the analysis for reasons cited under the discussion of the third statistical test). The final test was an analysis of variance of the mean grant size of regional projects; projects were classified according to a scheme analogous to that used for the seventh statistical test. No significant difference was found among the means for the three categories of project continuation.

B Questionnaire for Superintendents who have never received Title III funds

Questionnaire for Superintendents

Name of school district_____

Enclosed is a list of projects in Massachusetts sponsored under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. You may refer to this list, if necessary, in answering the following questions:

1. Have you heard of any ESEA Title III projects outside your district? 104 - yes; 1 - uncertain; 5 - no.

2. Are you familiar with the program of one or more ESEA Title III project outside your district?
90 - yes; 5 - uncertain; 14 - no.

3. Has your school district (or any educator in your district) changed or modified any educational procedures in response to ideas or information gained from ESEA Title III projects outside your district? 29 - yes; 34- uncertain; 42 - no.

   If yes, please specify. If possible, indicate how you or others learned about the project.

4. What sources do you find most helpful in gaining information on educational innovations?
   54 - Professional journals (if so, which ones?)
   60 - Mailings of pamphlets, newsletters, etc.
   30 - Books
   7 - Television

5 - Radio
29 - Newspapers
30 - Magazines
74 - Professional conventions
11 - Education courses at colleges
55 - Visits to innovative projects
74 - Publications from the Bureau of Curriculum Innovation at the Massachusetts Department of Education (Kaleidoscope, Keynotes, etc.)
81 - Other school administrators
31 - Teachers
10 - Students
9 - Parents
34 - Massachusetts Department of Education personnel
4 - Other (Please specify)

5. Indicate your reaction to each of the statements below using the following abbreviations:

DS - Disagree strongly
D - Disagree
U - Uncertain
A - Agree
AS - Agree strongly

(a) In Massachusetts we are proceeding too rapidly in introducing into the schools innovations which have not been thoroughly tested.
25 - DS; 40 - D; 23 - U; 12 - A; 7 - AS.

(b) It is difficult to obtain reliable information for assessing the merits of popular educational innovations.
2 - DS; 18 - D; 8 - U; 59 - A; 21 - AS.

(c) My school district is usually supportive of attempts to introduce innovations.
0 - DS; 8 - D; 14 - U; 71 - A; 14 - AS.

C Questionnaire for Superintendents who have received Title III funds

Section I

Name of school district_____

Enclosed is a list of projects in Massachusetts sponsored under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. You may refer to this list, if necessary, in answering the following questions:

1. Have you heard of any ESEA Title III projects outside your district? 108 - yes; 1 - uncertain; 2 - no.

2. Are you familiar with the program of one or more ESEA Title III project outside your district?
101 - yes; 3 - uncertain; 7 - no.

3. Has your school district (or any educator in your district) changed or modified any educational procedures in response to ideas or information gained from ESEA Title III projects outside your district? 58 - yes; 34 - uncertain; 17 - no.

If yes, please specify. If possible, indicate how you or others learned about the project.

4. What sources do you find most helpful in gaining information on educational innovations?
56 - Professional journals (if so, which ones?)
63 - Mailings of pamphlets, newsletters, etc.
26 - Books
7 - Television
3 - Radio
26 - Newspapers
28 - Magazines
78 - Professional conventions
11 - Education courses at colleges
75 - Visits to innovative projects
85 - Publications from the Bureau of Curriculum Innovation at the Massachusetts Department of Education (Kaleidoscope, Keynotes, etc.)
73 - Other school administrators
35 - Teachers
6 - Students
4 - Parents
30 Massachusetts Department of Education personnel
3 Other (please specify)

5. Indicate your reaction to each of the statements below using the following abbreviations:

DS - Disagree strongly
D - Disagree
U - Uncertain
A - Agree
AS - Agree strongly

(a) In Massachusetts we are proceeding too rapidly in introducing into the schools innovations which have not been thoroughly tested.
23 - DS; 51 - D; 19 - U; 12 - A; 4 - AS.

(b) It is difficult to obtain reliable information for assessing the merits of popular educational innovations.
1 - DS; 23 - D; 6 - U; 49 - A; 19 - AS.
(c) My school district is usually supportive of attempts to introduce innovations.
2 - DS; 8 - D; 3 - U; 77 - A; 27 - AS.

IF YOUR DISTRICT HAS RECEIVED ESEA TITLE III FUNDS, OR HAS PARTICIPATED IN A REGIONAL ESEA TITLE III PROJECT, GO ON TO SECTION II. OTHERWISE, STOP HERE. THANK YOU.

Section II

(To be completed if the district has received ESEA Title III funds)

Name of project_____

If your district has received ESEA Title III funds for more than one project, please report on each project. Number the projects and number each of your responses to the items accordingly.

1. Description of project: (check one or more of the following)
58 - Curriculum development and/or implementation
13 - Reorganization of school structure
38 - Teacher training
32 - Services for handicapped
27 - Media centers and/or new technology
3 - Guidance/counseling
6 - Community participation or social or racial integration
13 - Other (please specify)

2. How well has the project come up to your expectations?
27 - Exceeded expectations
42 - Met expectations
20 - Fell somewhat short of expectations
8 - Fell far short of expectations
0 - Uncertain

3. Do you think that the evaluation of the project as required by ESEA Title III has been useful to you or others in making decisions about the project?
46 - yes; 20 - uncertain; 12 - no; 18 - evaluation data not yet available.

4. Do you think that ESEA Title III has made your community more open to innovation?
52 - Definitely yes
29 - Perhaps a little
10 - Uncertain
5 - Probably not
1 - Definitely not

5. Are you aware of other school districts which have adopted all or part of your ESEA Title III project? If so, state the number of school districts and describe, if you can, the means of dissemination used to reach these districts.

14 - yes

6. Is the project being continued (or likely to be continued) after the termination of federal funding?
20 - no
33 - yes, on a smaller scale or with only some of the components
21 - yes, on the same scale
7 - yes, on a larger scale
7 - uncertain

7. If the project or important components of the project are not being continued (or are not likely to be continued) by local funds, indicate what you believe to be the reasons:
4 - Project being continued by other than local funds
6 - Inadequate public relations within the community
8 - Project not successful in meeting its objectives
15- Project too expensive for the district to continue
9 - The district was never really committed to the project from the beginning
1 - Project does not fit the goals or structure of the existing school program
3 - No necessity to continue; objectives were completed within the time span provided by federal funds
4 - The school districts involved in the project failed to cooperate on a regional basis
5 - Personnel problems
2 - District unwilling to spend money on innovations
2 - Project too ambitious to be managed effectively
6 - Not enough time to demonstrate the value of the project
3 - Failure of the project staff to work closely with the school committee
5 - Failure of the project staff to work closely with the school administrators
0 - Lack of support or guidance from the Massachusetts Department of Education, ESEA Title III staff
3 - Project not visible enough
4 - Project served too few students
7 - Uncertainty of federal funds hampered effectiveness
4 - Other (please specify)